

A COUNSEL OF PERFECTION: A PLAN FOR AN AUTOMATIC COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF A STATE TAX FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

By J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

(Read April 17, 1913.)

The example of the western state universities suggests a similar organization for other states. Here in Pennsylvania the University, dating from 1740, when under the inspiration of Whitefield, the plan of a school was first mooted, has outgrown its modest endowments. Biennially it goes to the legislature to ask help to carry on its work. In the interval it appeals to its alumni and friends for help to meet its pressing needs, higher salaries, a larger teaching force, and more buildings and appliances for its multifarious educational needs.

What is true of the University of Pennsylvania is true of all other universities and colleges of Pennsylvania, and of the East and South, and no matter how large their endowments and income, each and all require more money to keep pace with the growing expenses of higher education in the modern university.

It needs no apology to broach the matter here, for Franklin founded both the American Philosophical Society and the University of Pennsylvania. In fact after the Revolution the charter of his College of Philadelphia was taken away, and a Charter given to the University of the State of Pennsylvania, and the constitution affirmed the duty of the state to help it. Later the charter of the college was restored, and still later the college and the university were united in the University of Pennsylvania, and it has grown to its present great estate under that charter and that name.

From time to time the state has aided it, and private munificence has enabled it to provide the splendid buildings in which it is now housed, with College and Law and Medical Departments, and to

maintain the Towne Engineering School, and the Wharton School of Finance and Economy, and the Zoölogical and Dental and Veterinary Schools, and a long list of endowed Professorships and Fellowships and Scholarships and prizes. With all these, and the other resources of the university, there is still an annual deficit which must be met. To do so would require an additional endowment sufficient to provide an income of half a million dollars to meet the needs of the university. How to provide this is a question that taxes the university authorities and exacts time, thought and anxiety of provost, trustees, faculty and alumni, when they ought to be free to give attention to the work of instruction and to raising the standard of education in all its departments.

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Montana, Wisconsin, are among the western states which have state universities. In their state constitutions provision is made for an automatic assignment of a small part of the state taxes for their support. Thus all appeal to the state legislature for support is made unnecessary. In Wisconsin, and in many other universities, colleges, etc., the United States Land Grant is made part of the endowment of the state university, and for agricultural and technical schools. Iowa has recently put all its educational institutions under a single governing board. All the western universities have out of the increasing wealth and revenues of their states provided incomes growing in proportion to their needs, and their activities keep pace with them. University extension lectures carry their teachers to every part of their state, and every branch of education is fostered under intelligent guidance, with university men spreading the influence for higher and better education.

A constitutional convention is soon to be called in Pennsylvania. There a plan should be formulated, submitted and discussed for a reorganization that may strengthen institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. The plan and method of securing automatically a portion of the state revenue for the purpose of education are now in force in twenty one states, so that there is little novelty in the idea, for it has been in practical operation in all of them, with various differences, and yet almost uniformly successful results. Only recently, in acknowledging a paper on German Universities, that

Nestor of both American and German universities, the Hon. Andrew D. White, of Cornell, wrote:

“It is doing a duty to the country to call attention to the evils caused by the scattering of resources among so large a number of institutions bearing the name of ‘University.’

“The worst affliction of our whole existing system is the fact that such a multitude of institutions which ought to be called ‘Colleges’ are pretending to do University work, while they are in no condition to do the duties worthy of that name.

“What the country needs is a concentration upon a smaller number of Universities, with a large number,—no matter how large indeed,—discharging a function akin to that of the ‘Gymnasia’ in Germany, which might very honorably be called ‘Colleges.’ An example of a better practice may be found in some parts of New England, where institutions, some of which were up to a recent time called ‘Universities,’ have become frankly ‘Colleges.’

“We are about to have Universities which will give us high rank throughout the World, and among them especially the State Universities of the West, as well as some that have been established upon large foundations in the eastern part of our country.

“As to the Western State Universities, their progress is simply amazing. There has been developed an honorable pride in them by their respective states, and this has been deepened by a very honorable rivalry between sundry commonwealths, as for example Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, which has resulted in a magnificent fruitage.

“While the standard of scholarship is kept deplorably low in some of the smaller Universities, it has been steadily rising in many of the better endowed institutions. The increase of lectures by distinguished foreign professors at various American Universities of the better sort, will be productive of great good. Cornell, for example, is about to have an extended course of lectures on American History, by a renowned Oxford Professor upon the Goldwin Smith Foundation. Who would not gladly exchange our scattered flock of Universities and Colleges, running up into the hundreds, for the twenty two Universities of Germany?”

There too the important cities of Hamburg and Frankfurt are about to coördinate all their existing institutions of science, art and literature, into great metropolitan universities, retaining all the useful elements of successful and thorough education and training, and elevating the standard of work.

Against the twenty-four universities, and nine technical schools, of Germany, the last report of the Commissioner of Education of the United States reported nearly five hundred universities and

colleges for men, and one hundred and thirty for women, and over one hundred and fifty technical schools, nearly one hundred law schools, and proportionately numerous medical, dental, pharmaceutical, and other allied special schools. With this enormous disparity in numbers, it is easy to see why the German schools and universities do their work thoroughly and well.

The state regulations and examinations for the bar and for medicine and various other professions and employments, show the need felt for something more than the diploma of university, college or technical school.

A state university, representing, in its government, all the institutions of instruction in education, in all its varieties, general and technical, would give strength to each and all of the schools affiliated with it, and its degrees, awarded on their recommendation, would be greatly enhanced in value.

The first step in Pennsylvania would be to take advantage of the proposed constitutional convention, and introduce into the new state constitution,

First.—Provisions for an automatic appropriation of part of the revenue of the state, to higher education, to be distributed in the maintenance of a University of the State of Pennsylvania, and allied colleges and technical schools, thus going back to the wise provision of the Constitution of 1779.

Second.—Legislative power to strengthen and increase the power of the College and University Council, with the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney General, State Officers, ex officio, and the presidents of the University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Lehigh, Bucknell, and of Washington, Jefferson, State, Franklin & Marshall and other colleges and other institutions, the members.

Third.—To give that board power to distribute the state educational fund among the state universities, colleges, technical schools and other institutions of learning, science and art, on such terms as to numbers of teachers and students, standards, and other conditions as may be prescribed by the college and university council.

Fourth.—To make all universities, colleges, technical schools and

institutions for higher education, branches of the university of the state, retaining their names, organization, endowments, etc., but requiring annual returns of all the details of numbers, income, work, etc., on a uniform basis, with provision for inspection, audit, examination, so thorough that the highest standard of efficiency may be secured and maintained, under the penalty of losing any claim to the income from the state education fund; the council to have the right and privilege of approving and recommending the degrees in course conferred by the university and other universities and colleges of the state, with power to revoke or modify charters of any affiliated institution for cause.

Fifth.—The college and university council to have power to consolidate existing institutions working in one district or multiplying the work that could be better done by one strong institution, thus giving to the state one or more medical, legal, technical or other schools, in lieu of an unnecessarily large number of small schools, weakened by competition, lessening standards, and not really serving the state, owing to insufficient means and inefficient methods.

Sixth.—Uniting with the state university, libraries, university extension work, scientific and art and technical schools and museums, in such a way that all unnecessary duplication may be prevented, and higher education ensured through uniform grants from the state educational fund.

Seventh.—The college and university council to have the inspection of the normal schools, in such a way as to unite in close sequence the methods of education, from the public and private schools, the normal schools, etc., through the colleges and technical schools and up to the university.

Twenty states have made provision in their constitutions for automatic collection and distribution of a small part of the revenue of the State to aid in the work of education of its people, and Pennsylvania should make similar provision in its new constitution. It would increase the efficiency of its institutions of learning, relieve the legislature of a task which is no part of its proper duty, free the trustees and officers and faculties of our universities and colleges from the necessity of going to the legislature and the governor of

the commonwealth, give them a right to a part of the state revenue thus set apart for education, elevate the standards and enhance their efficiency, by allying them with the University of the State of Pennsylvania, and give their degrees a position recognized through the state and beyond it.

This may be a counsel of perfection, but none the less well worth discussion and careful consideration by the American Philosophical Society, true to its purpose of promoting useful knowledge. What can be more useful than to know how best to bring to bear on education the means and methods of securing that which is best fitted to prepare men and women to be good citizens, to teach them all that is necessary, to secure them the best schools for every profession and occupation, and to reform existing institutions of learning, so that they may do the greatest good to the largest number?

Make the state supply from its plethoric treasury, the money required for higher education, as it does for secondary and elementary schools, and then the distribution may be safely put into the hands of the state's college and university council, composed of state officers and the representatives of the universities and colleges and technical schools. Among them will be found men who will see that the state's money is well spent, with a proper distribution between buildings and maintenance, salaries and expenses incidental to instruction.

The state will supply through its *ex-officio* members and its trained inspectors due protection against undue expenditure of any kind.

The state college and university council may properly insist that wherever money is given for any special purpose, it shall be enough to provide for future maintenance, and not be, as it too often is the case today, a burden on income. There are plenty of reforms incidental to a reorganization of our institutions of learning, that will need the careful consideration of the state college and university council. A few years will serve to show how unnecessary duplication of work can be prevented, how neighboring colleges can be united into one strong college, how technical and professional schools can be strengthened by reducing their number, and increasing their

efficiency, how an exchange of professors may be systematized to the advantage of teachers and students, and how the standard of education may be raised.

Much will be done by the teachers themselves, and there can be no better inspiration to improve methods than to draw from the great body of men trained in the work of education, the results of their experience. Of course there will be impracticable suggestions and unworkable plans proposed, but those will all be submitted to the trained and experienced members of the State college and university council, and after full discussion, their judgment will choose the good and reject the bad. Plans and methods of teaching will be entrusted to experienced teachers, and the profession will rise in dignity and importance, as the work shows the good results of their experience, knowledge and ability. All this and much else can be accomplished if the new constitution of Pennsylvania makes the business of education a matter of state support and state government.

Andrew D. White, that Nestor of Higher Education in this country, first president of Cornell University, and always its inspiration, read a paper on "Advanced Education," before the National Education Association at Detroit, in 1874. Urgent arguments are brought forward for a reorganization of American universities and colleges and technical schools as part of the work of the state. Dr. White urges the necessity of careful public provision by the people for their own system of advanced instruction as the only republican and democratic method. Public provision, he said, is alone worthy of our dignity as citizens. It will stimulate private gifts and free them from the dogmas of living donors and dead testators. The nucleus of Cornell University was the national land grant, which has been supplemented by an increasing flow of private gifts to the endowment.

The state of Michigan made the national land grant the foundation of its great university, and has added to it from time to time with the best results. It has thus strengthened the whole system of public education throughout the state. The national grant and the state grant together have thus been united to make a great university, and provide the endowment of advanced instruction, and to coördi-

nate education from the primary school to the highest technical and scientific and classical and collegiate and professional training.

Such an example and that of twenty other States all point to the best way of meeting the general demand for a more regular and thorough public provision for advanced education, not through appeals to legislatures, to be subject to all the risks of overtaxed public bodies, but by a constitutional provision for a fixed, though small, percentage of the income of the State to be set apart for higher education and for all branches of education that ought to be maintained at the public expense, to be expended through the college and university council, made up of state officials and representatives of universities and colleges and institutions of advanced scientific and technical education. Established by law in 1895, it only needs increased power to do its best work.

Well directed public bounty, as President White says, stimulates private bounty. Generous men and women, seeing that the current needs of such institutions were provided by state revenue, would gladly give freely and largely for such special additions as may appeal to them. The alumni of universities will find new inspiration for their activity in giving, advising, and encouraging the growth and prosperity and advancement of their alma mater. Thus, nation, state, alumni and individual grants and gifts would be united to strengthen state institutions and enable them to give the highest literary, scientific and industrial instruction.

The same trend of educated opinion is found in other publication of the highest authority. In the 44th annual report of the Smithsonian Institute, that for 1880, Professor Herbert B. Adams's paper on the state and higher education gives the strongest facts and arguments in support of state aid. He points out that in colonial days Maryland began her educational history by paying a tobacco tax for the support of William and Mary College in Virginia. Vermont appropriated a township of land for Dartmouth College in New Hampshire. New Haven sent corn to the support of Harvard. In later times Michigan gave to the university one twentieth of a mill tax on every dollar of taxable property: Wisconsin one eighth of a mill; Nebraska three eighths of a mill; California one tenth of a

mill; and now the same rule holds in so many states that it may be described as the normal basis for state aid to higher education.

In the proceedings of the National Education Association there are abundant evidences that the leading and recognized authorities on education in this country take the same view.

In the report for 1900, President Swain, then of Indiana University, now of Swarthmore, gave a sketch of the history of the promotion of higher education by the state from early times until the present. He gives forty-five as the number of colleges and universities supported by the state, and points to seven representative state universities—California, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wisconsin.

President Beardshear of Iowa State College of Agriculture, said there were 64 colleges or departments inaugurated by the Act of Congress of 1862, making land grants for the establishment of schools for mechanical and agricultural instruction.

Again at the National Education Association meeting of July, 1901, President Jesse of the State University of Wisconsin, read a paper on the "Function of the State University." He points out the opportunities for collaboration with state boards, bureaus and commissions, with a view to serious study of social and economic conditions.

Today and in and by our own university much is done for the state and the city, but as a matter of grace; make it the university of the state, and state and city would ask for help as a matter of right. Social and economical and legal problems would be attacked and solved. By coöperation with boards of education and state and local superintendents, the university would help to build up schools, from primary to normal, by trained inspectors, skilled examiners, lecturers, practical teachers. Colleges and higher technical schools should be brought into union with the university, all working towards the common end and aim, the best education of the largest number.

The university of the state should be in close touch with all the state boards, bureaus and commissions, the geological survey, the bureaus of health, education, forestry, mines, industries, all the innumerable functions and activities of the state. The university should help in the preparation of laws governing taxation, every

day growing more complex, and in every form of economic instruction, for the benefit of the state in its legislation, and of the plain people. In Pennsylvania, mining, metallurgy, manufacturing, forestry, light, heat and power, are among the living issues that require sound legislation and to prepare it should be one of the functions of the university of the state.

The United States Bureau of Education publishes annually a Bulletin of Statistics of State Universities. These include a directory of state universities and other state-aided institutions of higher education, noting specially those endowed by the federal government under the Morrill Land Grant Acts. These numbered 87, besides 16 agricultural and mechanical colleges for colored students, in the list for the year ended June 30, 1912. There are tables showing the teaching force, the student enrollment, the property and income of the 87 state universities and state-aided institutions.

State universities and state-aided institutions of higher education included in this list, corrected by figures of Professor Maphis' Report, are as follows:

	Income from Mill Tax.
Arizona	32,000
California	750,000
Colorado	223,000
Illinois	
Indiana	173,000
Iowa	
Kentucky	47,000
Michigan	650,000
Michigan	173,000
Minnesota	260,000
Nebraska	411,000
Nevada	
New Mexico	
North Dakota	
North Dakota	
Ohio	92,000
Ohio	360,000
Ohio	88,000
Texas	
Utah	
Utah	
Wisconsin	664,000
Wyoming	24,000

President James of Illinois State University says the legislature of Illinois at its last session (1912) passed a law providing that a tax of one mill for every dollar of assessed valuation should be levied for the support of the university. This will give about two and a quarter million dollars per year, available July 1, 1913. Owing to the provision in the constitution of Illinois that the legislature may not make appropriations for longer than two years, the legislature must appropriate at each session the money represented by this mill tax and labeled for the support of the University of Illinois.

Michigan and Wisconsin provide for the levying of a certain so-called mill tax, three eighths or four fifths of a mill, the proceeds of which are turned over to the board of trustees of the beneficiary institution.

The statistics of state universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the state for the year ended June 30, 1912 (*Bulletin*, 1912, No. 33), give a great many details, among them a table of property and income of state universities and other state-aided institutions, showing that there were paid—

	By the State.	By the United States.
To the University of California	1,124,506	80,000
To the University of Indiana	1,918,900	79,938
To the University of Minnesota	2,314,713	80,000
To the University of Missouri	610,093	76,875
To the University of Nebraska	651,318	80,000
To the University of Cornell	478,000	72,000
Ohio { Ohio University		
{ Ohio State University }	1,131,778	50,000
{ Miami University		
To the University of Wisconsin	1,552,398	80,000

The same table gives the receipts from the mill tax and other sources of some of the states, as follows:

Colorado (4 institutions)	406,053
Indiana (2 institutions)	259,504
Iowa (3 institutions)	407,200
Michigan (2 institutions)	932,867
Minnesota	689,521
Nebraska	374,163
Ohio (2 institutions)	480,828
South Carolina	114,113

Utah	150,000
Wisconsin	1,103,029
Wyoming	84,000

The same table gives among the many private benefactions to those state-aided universities:

California	566,000
Nevada	150,000
Cornell	1,307,111

The records of these 87 state-aided institutions confirm the belief that private benefactions will continue to supplement in generous measure the state-aided institutions just as these show by their results that they are entitled to individual as well as state help.

Pennsylvania expended in 1912 for—

Department expenses	\$ 4,972,538.34
Expense of government	5,390,798.00
Commissions	407,900.00
State institutions	3,342,348.33
Penitentiaries and reformatories	544,378.69
Semi state institutions	685,750.00
Educational	8,737,600.00
Hospitals	2,683,650.00
Homes and other charitable institutions	368,300.00
Miscellaneous	1,059,500.00
	<u>\$28,192,763.36</u>

If the appropriations for education were made by the college and university council and those for forestry, mining, etc., by boards or commissions on which were the best experts from the universities and colleges and technical schools and museums, men of scientific attainments, the result would be economy in cost and increased efficiency.

It ought not to be difficult to fix a mill tax for higher education and to devise a plan by which it should be automatically collected and set apart and distributed by the college and university council in such a way as to do the greatest good to the greatest numbers, and at the same time invite a continuance and increase of the individual munificence so characteristic of Pennsylvania.

A bill was presented to the Legislature of Pennsylvania in March

for an automatic distribution of the aid which the state accords to hospitals and charitable institutions ; if passed, it would eliminate the methods characteristic of the distribution of state funds by the legislature for purely public charities.

Another bill provides for a charities bureau in the Department of the Auditor General to carry on the duties imposed on the Auditor General and the State Board of Charities.

The purpose of these bills is to make automatic distribution of state revenue to and among hospitals and charities doing the work for the people of the state, on the basis of services rendered, and a method of full returns of receipts and expenditures, with power by inspection to correct extravagance, and to compel economy in expenses of maintenance, and to prevent unnecessary duplication of institutions, but to require of them steady improvement and constant advance in methods and results.

The growing interest and general demand for the mill tax for the support of higher education are shown in recent reports, that for Virginia by Professor Charles D. Maphis, of the University of Virginia ; that for Texas by Professor Arthur Lefevre, of the University of Texas, and that for Ohio by President Alston Ellis, of Ohio University. That for Virginia is the report made by a commission to devise a systematic method to meet the demands of higher educational institutions, to prevent educational duplication and consequent financial waste, and to devise stable and systematic methods for the maintenance, management and expansion of these institutions. The report recommends for Virginia one medical school, one polytechnic school, and one university, and a permanent education commission with power to coöperate with the governing bodies of all institutions of higher education in Virginia through representatives.

Professor Maphis has collected and printed the opinions of representatives of the universities of California, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Minnesota, Kentucky, Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, and of the experts of the Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Education, of New York, and of the Bureau of Education of Washington.

Based on these and other evidence, Virginia is advised to adopt

a mill tax for higher education and with and through it to reorganize its institutions of higher education so that they may grow with the growth of the state and with its income and make return in increased work for the state and its people.

In the college and university council of Pennsylvania the state has a capital piece of machinery for the distribution of the proceeds of a state mill tax for higher education. In that council there are the representatives of the state, the governor, the attorney general, and the superintendent of public instruction, and of the universities, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Lehigh and Bucknell, and of the colleges, Washington-Jefferson, State, Franklin & Marshall, and an eminent citizen representing the Catholic institutions of higher education. With such men that council could be safely entrusted with power to make a distribution of any sum raised by a mill tax, so that it can be distributed to the greatest advantage of all the institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania.

The last report of the Superintendent of Education gives a list of six universities, twenty-nine colleges, four law schools, four dental schools, three pharmacy schools, thirteen normal schools and seven technical schools in Pennsylvania.

The state has created many examining boards for law, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, veterinary candidates, osteopathy, accountants, and boards for the geological and topographic survey, vaccination, health, mining, etc., and all of them might well be affiliated with the college and university council, which could designate university and college experts to carry on the work.